UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,242	06/24/2003	Ye Fang	SP02-143	1181

22928 7590 11/29/2007

CORNING INCORPORATED
SP-TI-3-1
CORNING, NY 14831

EXAMINER	
YANG, NELSON C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1641	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/602,242	FANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nelson Yang	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 September 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,9-18 and 42-61* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,9-18 and 42-61* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 June 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 20, 2007 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-15, 7, 42-44, 46, 49-61 is acknowledged and has been entered.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-18, 42-61 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 9-16, 18, 42-50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 59, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Yamazaki et al. [US 6,699,719] in view of Umek et al. [US 2003/0124572].

With respect to claims 1, 42, 49, 57, Yamazaki et al. teach biosensor arrays comprising substrates with a plurality of distinct membranes of bilayer regions (column 7, lines 40-50).

Assays are performed by incubating the arrays with a cholera toxin solution (column 31, lines 65-67), followed by washing (column 32, lines 1-3), and imaged with a fluorescence microscope (column 32, lines 5-10). Yamazaki et al. further teach contacting a sample comprising a mixture of ligands to the array and detecting binding of the selected ligand to receptors in the lipid bilayer which specifically bind to it (column 4, lines 25-30). Yamazaki et al. do not teach membranes deposited on an amine-presenting molecule, wherein the lipid membranes are bound by an amine-presenting molecule or a silane.

Umek et al., however, teach immobilized lipid layers that are fixed and/or cross-linked to provide greater stability (para. 0048), wherein the lipid layers are fixed using amines such as poly-lysine or polyethylene imine (para. 0075) or silanes such as chlorosilanes or alkoxysilanes (para. 0073).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the support to immobilize the lipid membranes of Yamazaki et al. with silanes or amine presenting molecules such as PEI or poly-lysine, as suggested by Umek et al., in order to provide greater stability to the membranes of Yamazaki et al.

6. With respect to claims 2, 4-5, Yamazaki et al. teach that the arrayed membranes comprise gangliosides that bind to cholera toxin (column 31, example 8).

7. With respect to claim 9, the arrays are arranged into corrals of 500 microns^2 (column 31, lines 45-50).

8. With respect to claims 10-12, 14-15, 43, 44, Yamazaki et al. teach that the toxin is labeled with Texas Red (column 64-66), the and the fluorescence microscope detects the corrals

with bound cholera toxin as red (column 32, lines 1-10) while the non-bound corrals remain green (column 32, lines 5-8).

9. With respect to claim 13, Yamazaki et al. teach a competitive assay between a fluorescent antagonist (column 34, lines 65-67), and a receptor sensitive antagonist (column 35, lines 1-5).

10. With respect to claim 16, the substrate can be a silicon wafer (column 12, lines 20-26).

11. With respect to claim 18, Yamazaki et al. teach that the substrate can comprise well plate having surface detector array devices at the bottom of the wells (column 5, lines 18-20).

12. With respect to claim 45, Yamazaki et al. teach that the arrays are washed after incubation with the toxin (column 31, line 66 – column 32, line 4).

13. With respect to claim 46, Yamazaki et al. teach that the arrays are incubated with cholera toxin which binds to ganglioside GM1 (column 31, lines 62-65). The fluorescence microscope detects the corrals with bound cholera toxin as red (column 32, lines 1-10) while the non-bound corrals remain green (column 32, lines 5-8). Therefore, a decrease in the green fluorescence indicates binding of cholera toxin to ganglioside GM1.

14. With respect to claims 47-48, Yamazaki et al. teach that measurement may be performed using capacitative detection or impedance analysis (column 18, lines 43-46).

15. With respect to claim 50, Yamazaki et al. teach that the sample is cholera toxin which binds to ganglioside GM1 (column 31, lines 62-65). The fluorescence microscope detects the corrals with bound cholera toxin as red (column 32, lines 1-10) while the non-bound corrals remain green (column 32, lines 5-8).

16. With respect to claims 52, 54, 56, as discussed above, the amines used by Umek et al. may be polyamines such as poly-lysine or polyethylene imine (para. 0075).

17. With respect to claims 60 and 61, as discussed above, the amines used by Umek et al. may be silanes containing such as alkoxysilanes (para. 0073),.

18. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Yamazaki et al. [US 6,699,719] in view of Umek et al. [US 2003/0124572], and further in view of Pluskal et al. [US 5,004,543].

With respect to claim 17, Yamazaki et al. teach biosensor arrays comprising substrates with a plurality of distinct membranes of bilayer regions (column 7, lines 40-50). Assays are performed by incubating the arrays with a cholera toxin solution (column 31, lines 65-67), followed by washing (column 32, lines 1-3), and imaged with a fluorescence microscope (column 32, lines 5-10). Yamazaki et al. do not teach a microporous support.

Pluskal et al., however, teach a charge-modified, hydrophobic microporous membrane and further teaches that the membrane exhibits a combination of ionic and hydrophobic properties, rendering them highly effective for macromolecular adsorption applications under a variety of conditions (column 2, lines 35-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a charge-modified, hydrophobic microporous membrane as the support in the method of Yamazaki et al. and Umek et al., as suggested by Pluskal et al., as the membrane is highly effective for macromolecular adsorption applications under a variety of conditions.

19. Claims 51, 53, 55, 59, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Yamazaki et al. [US 6,699,719] in view of Umek et al. [US 2003/0124572] and further in view of Patton [US 4,933,285].

With respect to claims 51, 53, 55, 59, Yamazaki et al. teach biosensor arrays comprising substrates with a plurality of distinct membranes of bilayer regions (column 7, lines 40-50). Assays are performed by incubating the arrays with a cholera toxin solution (column 31, lines 65-67), followed by washing (column 32, lines 1-3), and imaged with a fluorescence microscope (column 32, lines 5-10). Yamazaki et al. do not teach a coating of γ-aminopropylsilane on the support.

Patton, however, teaches substrates comprising coatings of γ-aminopropylsilane (column 4, lines 15-20). Patton further teaches that this produces solid phases that serve to anchor reaction products to a solid phase, while permitting the unreacted reagents to be removed (column 3, lines 35-42). Therefore, this would allow Yamazaki et al. to anchor lipid membranes to the support that have reacted with the γ-aminopropylsilane, while removing unbound lipid membranes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the inventionto have a coating of γ-aminopropylsilane to anchor lipid membranes to the support that have reacted with the γ-aminopropylsilane, while removing unbound lipid membranes, thus providing a more stable structure for detecting toxins, allowing for a stronger signal.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-18, 42-61 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

21. No claims are allowed.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson Yang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0826. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long V. Le can be reached on (571)272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson Yang
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641

LONG V. LE 11/25/07
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600